

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to express appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, and for the acknowledgment of Applicants' Claim for Priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

Applicants note that an Information Disclosure Statement was filed in the present application on January 5, 2004, prior to issuance of the Official Action, but that no Form PTO-1449 was returned to Applicants. Further, a review of the PAIR system, and the Image File Wrapper thereon, indicate that the Information Disclosure Statement was received and scanned into the electronic file wrapper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement, and acknowledge such consideration by returning a copy of the Form PTO-1449 with the next Official Action.

Claims 1 and 2 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and allowance of claims 1 and 2 in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate and proper.

On page 2 of the Official Action, claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over YAGI et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,273,348) in view of GRIFFIN (U.S. Patent No. 2,805,737).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1 includes, inter alia, “a master cylinder holding a first braking liquid pressurized in accordance with a stroke of the brake pedal stepped by a user; . . . an accumulator for accumulating a second braking liquid pressurized by a pressurizing member; a proportional pressure controller for controlling the pressure of the second braking liquid in the accumulator, and supplying the second braking liquid to a wheel”.

Applicants submit that YAGI et al. lacks any disclosure of a *second braking liquid* being supplied to a wheel, as recited in claim 1. In this regard, Applicants note that in the system of YAGI et al., the *second braking liquid* which is accumulated in accumulator 7c (as designated by the Examiner) is not supplied to a wheel by the proportional pressure controller 51 (as designated by the Examiner). Instead, only the *first braking liquid* from the master cylinder 2 is supplied to the braking system 3, via the master cylinder pressure supply line 10. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the system disclosed in YAGI et al., in which the liquid from the master cylinder is supplied to the wheel, is clearly different than the presently claimed system, in which a separate liquid from an accumulator is supplied to the wheel.

Claim 1 further includes, inter alia, “a relief valve and a return valve intervened in a passage in parallel between the master cylinder and the auxiliary controller; the relief valve allowing the first braking liquid having a pressure greater than a predetermined pressure to be guided from the master cylinder into the auxiliary controller, and blocking the first braking liquid from the auxiliary controller to the master cylinder; the return valve allowing the first braking liquid from the auxiliary controller to the master cylinder, and blocking the first braking liquid from the master cylinder to the auxiliary controller”.

Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a relief valve/return valve such as elements 9-11 of GRIFFIN in the system of YAGI et al. between the master cylinder 2 and the auxiliary controller 50 (as designated by the Examiner). Applicants submit that such modification would destroy the teachings of YAGI et al. itself. In this regard, Applicants note that any introduction of such relief and return valves along the master cylinder pressure supply line 10 in the system of YAGI et al. would alter the functional relationship between the master cylinder 2, the pressure control valve 5 and the pressure multiplier 12, and defeat the suggested benefit of such a structural arrangement as disclosed in YAGI et al. itself.

Further, Applicants note that at the most GRIFFIN would appear to teach the provision of such relief and return valves 10, 11 immediately upstream of wheels 5, 6, rather than between a master cylinder and downstream controllers. Accordingly, the teachings of GRIFFIN could not possibly be viewed as motivating one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such relief and return valves in an upstream position, such as between the master cylinder 2 and the auxiliary controller 50 (as designated by the Examiner) in the system of YAGI et al.

Further still, Applicants submit that the modification suggested by the Examiner is clearly based upon impermissible hindsight reasoning, rather than the teachings of the references themselves.

P24099.A02

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper at least for each and certainly for all of the above reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and an early indication of the allowance of these claims.


SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action and allowance of the present application and all of the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

Applicants have made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believe that they have now done so.

Should there be any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
M. YOSHINO et al.

  
Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

June 30, 2004  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191